

September 11th has led to many pronouncements that Americans have come to reaffirm the moral imperatives on which our Nation was founded. But, its aftermath has also shown the immediacy of taking real steps to protect people's lives. Already, Federal authorities have seen a rise in violence against Arab Americans with nearly 5,000 documented incidents and several murders motivated by prejudice. This is in addition to countless acts of violence that are reported every year against African Americans, Asian Americans, Jews, gays and lesbians, and women among other minorities. The facts show that it is time that we enforce a no tolerance policy on acts of hate.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our Nation's ideals, to stand united against hatred and intolerance, and demand action on this important hate crimes legislation.

IN HONOR OF THE ARMENIAN  
EVANGELICAL CHURCH OF HOLLYWOOD'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor the Armenian Evangelical Church of Hollywood. On November 23, 2002, the church will celebrate its 20th Anniversary and we would like to offer our congratulations and good wishes on this most noteworthy occasion.

The Armenian Evangelical Church of Hollywood, founded in May of 1982, began as a ministry created by the Rev. Abraham Jizmejjan and the Rev. Abraham Chaparian. The Hollywood Pastoral Ministry, as it was designated in the early days of the church, offered church services, fellowship groups, Bible study and a variety of other pastoral services.

In June of 1982, after the current day church had been formed, the church was officially accepted by the Armenian Evangelical Union of North America and from that time, the church has devoutly served its community. Today, the congregation numbers over 250 and is served by a number of church ministries, including Sunday school, men's and women's fellowship, Bible study and youth ministry.

Over the years, the church has always made a special commitment to the youth of its congregation and community. It was from this commitment that the church, nine years ago, founded New Direction For Armenian Youth, to serve at risk youth in church and surrounding areas. The program has helped countless young people and their families in coping with many of the harmful influences that pervade many of our communities.

We ask all Members of Congress to join us in honoring the Armenian Evangelical Church of Hollywood on the church's 20th Anniversary and wish the church many fulfilling days to come.

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL  
RECREATION AREA

SPEECH OF

**HON. NANCY PELOSI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 24, 2001*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 941, the Rancho Corral de Tierra Golden Gate Boundary Adjustment Act. This bill contains several provisions that will enhance preservation of our natural and cultural resources in California.

I applaud my colleague from California, Representative LANTOS, for championing the expansion of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Mateo County. This bill would add close to five thousand acres to the park, including Rancho Corral de Tierra, one of the largest undeveloped properties on the San Francisco Peninsula and one of the few remaining ranchos from the era of Spanish land grants.

This acquisition, conducted through a public-private partnership, will allow the park service to protect spectacular views, three complete watersheds, and habitat of rare and endangered species and plants.

Of great importance for the future of the park, S. 941 also reauthorizes the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore Advisory Commission. The Commission was established thirty years ago to provide for the free exchange of ideas between the National Park Service and the public, and it has ably carried out this mission.

I wish to acknowledge and thank all the members of the Commission for their dedicated service to the GGNRA and public, with special thanks to Chairman Richard Bartke and Vice Chair Amy Meyer. The GGNRA is one of the most complex parks in the country, and its diversity and vibrancy is due in no small part to the efforts of the Advisory Commission.

I look forward to working with Rep. LANTOS, my colleagues on the Resources Committee, and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that this bill is signed into law before Congress adjourns this year.

AMERICAN FRONTIERS: A PUBLIC  
LANDS JOURNEY

**HON. CHRIS CANNON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, from Native Americans to Mormon Pioneers to today's western travelers, people have long been captivated by the unique and beautiful landscape of my state. Utah's steep mountains, broad valleys, ancient rock formations and unique natural resources continue to draw visitors and many of my fellow Utahns to our public lands where a wide variety of outdoor activities can be enjoyed.

This coming Saturday, September 28, 2002, Utah and the Nation will celebrate National Public Lands Day. In Salt Lake City, we will welcome a special group of folks that spent the last two months on an incredible expedi-

tion. American Frontiers: A Public Lands Journey, is an educational project bringing the public lands story to life for thousands of school children and interested adults. Two teams of adventurers have been traveling entirely on public lands as they make their way from Canada and Mexico through six states on over 3,000 miles of rivers and trails, following in the pathways of pioneers and acting as modern explorers. American Frontiers has been made possible by a partnership involving dozens of organizations led by National Geographic Society, the U.S. Department of Interior, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, American Honda and the Coleman Company.

These modern explorers have produced wonderful and thoughtful stories about the diversity and value of the lands they traveled through in Utah and other states. I look forward to welcoming these adventurers to my home state on Saturday, and encourage every citizen to embrace the legacy of America's most beautiful lands on that day.

A TRIBUTE TO DARRYL HEUSTIS  
FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO  
VETERANS

**HON. JERRY LEWIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to Dr. Darryl Gordon Heustis, who has made his entire medical career one of service to our Nation's veterans. After 25 years at the Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Administration Medical Center in Loma Linda, California, Dr. Heustis is retiring today as the medical center's chief of staff.

In our modern, fast-paced, mobile world, it's rare to find a homegrown talent who grows up to serve his community as well as Dr. Heustis has in the Inland Empire. A native of Riverside, Darryl Heustis received a bachelor's degree in biology from the University of California, Riverside, and an MD from Loma Linda University. He completed his residency in pathology in 1977 at Loma Linda University Medical Center, and immediately went to work for the nearby Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Administration Medical Center.

The medical center was newly completed in 1977, and Dr. Heustis became one of the original employees. He served as Director of Laboratories until 1986, and then Chief of Laboratory Service for the next three years. He continued his education even as he worked full time in these jobs, and in 1983 received a masters degree in management from Claremont Graduate School. In 1989 Dr. Heustis was named Vice President of Medical Affairs, and has served as the medical center's chief of staff to this day.

During his career at the medical center, Dr. Heustis has helped ease the transition of the Veterans Administration from a hospital-room oriented facility to one that provides care to most veterans on an outpatient basis. Although the number of beds at the medical center has been reduced from 500 to 97, patient visits have grown to more than 340,000 a year. I applaud Dr. Heustis for meeting the prime responsibility of providing the very best care to our Nation's veterans, while at the

same time ensuring that Americans get maximum value from the taxes they pay.

Dr. Heustis has been a champion in the drive to ensure that our veterans are satisfied with the treatment they receive at the Pettis Memorial VA Medical Center. Under his leadership, the staff has met every challenge and has gained a reputation for quality care and sensitive treatment of veterans.

Over the years, the Jerry L. Pettis Memorial VA Medical Center has become highly respected as a teaching hospital. Working in close affiliation with Loma Linda University Medical Center, the VA medical center has provided a training ground for student doctors for nearly two decades. With its international reputation as a medical innovator, Loma Linda University has provided many benefits for the veterans at the VA, as well.

Dr. Heustis has taken a direct role in this relationship as a professor of pathology at the university, co-medical director of the School of Cytotechnology, and associate dean for veterans affairs. He has also published numerous articles in medical journals, and been a regular presenter at scientific symposiums. He has been named the "highest-rated lecturer" at sixteen symposiums since 1986, and received the Scissors Award from the Healthcare Leadership Institute in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Darryl Heustis has met the highest professional standards as a medical doctor, ensured top-notch care for hundreds of thousands of veterans, and overseen the education of countless student doctors over the past 25 years. Please join me in thanking him for his service to his community and our Nation, and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

#### RESOLUTIONS TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress face few decisions as important for their constituents as the issue of war or peace—sending young men and women into combat. And now, protecting Americans from terror attacks in the U.S. is equally vital. These crucial questions truly call for us to put aside political calculation and do what is right and best for America. These issues also call for us to resist a rush to judgment. We must take time to ensure that they are carefully weighed and thoroughly aired.

I oppose the resolution requested by President Bush that would give him a blank check to start a war against Iraq at any time and in any manner that he chooses. This clearly is too broad. It authorizes the President to act unilaterally no matter what the U.N. decides or does. That would abdicate congressional responsibility and is reminiscent of the equally open-ended Tonkin Gulf Resolution in 1964. It also fails to limit his authority to working within the U.N. framework on peaceful measures to enforce U.N. sanctions. Finally, the President's proposal embodies his alarming new doctrine of pre-emptive U.S. attacks on other nations even when they pose no imminent threat to the U.S.

Instead, I join with many of my colleagues who support a more sensible, more justified

and far less dangerous position: we advocate that the U.S. pursue inspections through the U.N., while continuing to deter Saddam Hussein, as we have been able to do for the past decade. To implement this view, we have introduced an alternative resolution endorsing President Bush's request for U.N. inspections.

The Administration simply has not made the case that Iraq threatens the United States with weapons of mass destruction, and that we are in such imminent danger of attack that U.S. military action is either the prudent or the justified course. Everyone agrees that Saddam Hussein is a very brutal dictator. He has: ruthlessly repressed his own people; committed aggression in the past; violated U.N. sanctions; sought to develop weapons of mass destruction; and remained hostile to the United States.

But that does not end the matter, for two reasons. First, the same could be said for any number of other countries, such as North Korea, China, and Iran. Will the U.S. attack each of them, and others, because some day they might be able to threaten us with weapons of mass destruction?

Second, even if a "regime change" in Iraq is desirable, that does not justify taking military action when it would risk so many dangers to America. Attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he does have against Israel, against our other allies, or against U.S. forces stationed in that region—a risk that even Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld acknowledged in recent congressional testimony. At present, Hussein is deterred by our threat of retaliatory destruction. He knows that, if he were to use weapons of mass destruction against us, then we would retaliate and destroy him. There is no evidence that Hussein seeks to commit suicide. But if we attack first, after announcing an intent to wipe him out, then what reason would he have to hold back?

A U.S. attack poses other severe dangers: American military commanders fear it would dilute our fight against al Qaida. We have not yet captured those who killed thousands of Americans, and who, we know, are still trying to kill more. That is job number one.

America's attacking Iraq alone would ignite a firestorm of anti-American fervor in the Middle East and Muslim world and breed thousands of new potential terrorists.

As we see in Afghanistan, there would be chaos and inter-ethnic conflict following Saddam's departure. A post-war agreement among them to cooperate peacefully in a new political structure would not be self-executing. Iraq would hardly become overnight a shining "model democracy" for the Middle East. We would need a U.S. peacekeeping force and nation-building efforts there for years. Despite rosy predictions that the Iraqi people would welcome our soldiers and aid workers with open arms, they would be arriving after years of U.S.-led economic sanctions, followed by violent U.S. bombing and combat. They will be the constant target of local hostility and terrorist attacks.

If we violate the U.N. Charter and unilaterally assault another country when it is not yet a matter of necessary self-defense, then we will set a dangerous precedent, paving the way for any other nation that chooses to do so, too, including those with nuclear weapons such as India and Pakistan and China.

We will trigger an arms-race of nations accelerating and expanding their efforts to develop weapons of destruction, so that they can deter "pre-emptive" hostile action by the U.S. Do we really want to open this Pandora's box?

The war, plus the need to rebuild Iraq and create a united, peaceful country, would cost billions of dollars badly needed at home. For millions of Americans, the biggest threat to their security in the lack of decent wage jobs, health insurance or affordable housing for their families. For senior citizens, it is their need to choose between buying enough food and buying prescription drugs. Indeed, most Americans are more frightened about security at our airports than about some strutting dictator thousands of miles away. Yet the Bush Administration's deficit budget won't even permit meeting the year-end deadline for installing new baggage and passenger screening systems to protect us against an immediate threat here at home.

The huge costs of war and nation building, which will increase our deficit, along with the impact of the likely sharp rise in oil prices, will deal a double-barreled blow to our currently fragile economy.

If it were plausible that we had to attack Iraq now, in order to head off strategic threats to the United States in the near future—and if alternatives had been exhausted, then that overriding concern might justify the risk of all these harmful consequences that are certain to follow U.S. military action. But the Bush Administration has not presented persuasive evidence that Saddam will soon be able to threaten America with weapons of mass destruction, or that he is likely to use them against us. Until then, a U.S. pre-emptive attack makes no sense, in light of the risks it would create and the clear harm it would cause to our national interests.

In fact, it is precisely because they lack such evidence that the President, Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY have increasingly downplayed claims of an impending nuclear threat from Iraq and have switched to elaborating on what a bad person Saddam has been.

But such a departure from the principles of our tradition—an unprovoked attack initiated by the U.S.—cannot be justified merely because we would prefer another regime in Baghdad, or because someday Saddam Hussein might present an actual strategic threat to U.S. security.

In addition, Americans should ask the White House and the Congress about the timing of the vote on any IRAQ resolution. What's the rush? According to press reports, our military leaders have made clear they will not be ready to launch an attack for months, and would prefer to do so in January or February. Why, then, do we need to decide such a complex and consequential issue in a few days? Why cut short the national debate to which the American people are entitled? Is it because the Administration is aware that a growing number of Americans are troubled by all of the unanswered questions? Americans are puzzled why Iraq has suddenly become such a threat that the White House is prepared to go to war and shed the blood of American men and women, not to mention great numbers of innocent Iraqi civilians.

They are right to ask. What has changed in the last six months or year that suddenly makes an attack on Iraq the leading item on